DEPAI

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Public Health Service

a 2088d

Food and Drug Administration
Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research
1401 Rockville Pike
Rockville MD 20852-1448

December 4, 2001

By Certified Mail—Return Receipt Requested

CBER-02-003

\$...

Warning Letter

Walter D. Holder, M.D., Director General Surgery Research Carolinas Medical Center 1000 Blythe Boulevard Charlotte, North Carolina 28203

Dear Dr. Holder:

During the period from August 27 to September 6, 2001, Eileen J. Bannerman and Tracy R. Ball, investigators from the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), inspected your conduct of clinical studies under IND — The inspection was conducted under the FDA's Bioresearch Monitoring Program that includes inspections designed to review the conduct of research involving investigational products.

At the end of the inspection, a Form FDA 483 (enclosed) was issued to you. We determined that you violated regulations governing the proper conduct of clinical studies involving investigational new drugs, as published in Title 21, <u>Code of Federal Regulations</u> (CFR), Parts 50 and 312. The applicable provisions of the CFR are cited for each violation.

1. You failed to ensure that the investigation was conducted according to the general investigational plan and protocol contained in the IND. [21 CFR § 312.50].

a. You failed to follow IND		
HIGH RISK FOR RECURRENCE M	IELANOMA PATIENTS WITH -	
	NE	when
you administered melanoma vaccine	е —————	
	anoma vaccine to	
	95-12, — -95-16, — -97-01, — -	
and —— -99-06) whom you e	enrolled on Protocol — You die	d not
amend the IND, as required to	by 21 CFR § 312:30.	

D.	CMVAC (Carolinas Melanoma Vaccine) Melanoma				
	Vaccii new p	" without submission of this rotocol to the FDA for review, as required by 21 CFR § 312.30(a).			
	obtair	cknowledge that you asked the FDA whether you were required to a new IND for melanoma vaccine in correspondence to Protocol However, by the of your request, you had already enrolled 84 subjects into Protocol			
	THE C				
C .	You failed to perform quality control testing for the investigational vaccine as required by protocol. One lot of investigational vaccine was contaminated with <i>Staphylococcus epidermidis</i> , but was administered to 38 subjects.				
d.	You failed to measure serum antibody titers every —— months, as specified by protocol.				
e .		ailed to ensure that the investigational vaccine was manufactured in dance with specifications in Protocol			
		Protocol —— states, "For each of the —— cell types, —— samples were prepared" However, the inspection revealed that approximately — samples were prepared for each cell line.			
		The protocol states, "All Culture Tests were done ————————————————————————————————————			
	III	According to the protocol, the following tests were to be performed on batch quantities of the product: "Routine, — and fungal cultures off — ' The inspection revealed that analyses for bacteria and fungi were done for only — lots of the investigational vaccine.			
f	You failed to meet the requirement of Protocol ———————————————————————————————————				

2.		ou failed to ensure that the investigation was conducted according to the nvestigational plan (protocol). [21 CFR § 312.60].			
	Althou	ugh you	administer — to subject — -98-21 according to the protocol. u gave an initial dose of — to this subject, you failed to administer lent doses of —		
3.	You failed to maintain adequate case histories. [21 CFR § 312.62(b)].				
	a.		ailed to document the occurrence of adverse events on the CRFs. ples are given below:		
			According to patient progress notes, subject — '-97-09 experienced "fever, chills, increasing shoulder pain and malaise of the injection site." In addition, he required surgical incision and drainage of "cloudy material" out of the injection site.		
		ii.	Patient progress notes state that subject — 00-36 was "sick for 2 weeks and had diarrhea and fatigue" requiring bed rest.		
			Protocol — states that the — was changed from in order to decrease the number of adverse events. In order to compare the — you must document all adverse events.		
	b.	writte	nspection revealed numerous examples where new entries were n over previous ones on the CRFs. In addition, white correction fluid used to obscure entries on CRFs.		
	C.		ailed to maintain all source documents to verify the information ed on the CRFs.		
			There are no source documents to verify entries on CRFs for subjects —— 95-05 (Skin Test Form #2) and —— -99-04 (———— Form).		
		ii.	There are discrepancies between source documents and CRF entries for subject — 00-13 with regard to which arm was used for the "Application Site."		

		For subject — 99-01, the expiration date of the was not recorded in the space provided on the CRF. Instead, the notation "Discarded" was written.
	d.	During the inspection, you were unable to provide a complete version of Protocol ———————————————————————————————————
4.		ailed to obtain informed consent in accordance with the provisions of R Part 50. [21 CFR § 312.60].
	melar note,	ailed to protect the rights of subject ——95-12 when the subject signed an ned consent document for the wrong investigational product. The subject defined the consent form entitled "Consent for Melanoma ————————————————————————————————————
5.		ailed to maintain adequate records showing the disposition of the tigational drug. [21 CFR §§ 312.57(a) and 312.62 (a)].
	a .	You failed to maintain product accountability records in the clinic for the quantity of the test article and the date of receipt.
	b.	You failed to document the destruction of the contaminated vials of Protocol ———— batch number ——
6.		failed to provide a complete list of the subinvestigators who assisted in the conduct of the investigations. [21 CFR § 312.53(c)(1)(viii)].
	Dr. (Forn	inspection revealed that you did not have a Form FDA 1572 to identify that Gerald Sonnenfeld assisted you in Protocol In addition, the only in FDA 1572 listing Dr. Didier Dreau as a subinvestigator was dated 8/21/01, years of participation as a subinvestigator in Protocols

This letter is not intended to be an all-inclusive list of deficiencies. It is your responsibility to ensure adherence to each requirement of the law and applicable regulations. You should take prompt action to correct these deviations. Failure to promptly correct these deviations may result in enforcement action without further notice. These actions could include termination of Investigational New Drug Applications and/or injunction.

You should notify this office in writing, within fifteen (15) business days after receipt of this letter, of the specific actions you have taken to correct the noted violations. If corrective action cannot be completed within fifteen (15) business days, state the reason for the delay and the time within which the corrections will be completed. Your response should include any documentation necessary to show that correction has been achieved.

Failure to achieve correction may result in enforcement action without further notice. The actions could include initiation of investigator disqualification proceedings which may render a clinical investigator ineligible to receive investigational new drugs.

Please send your written response to:

Mary Andrich, M.D. (HFM-664)
Office of Compliance and Biologics Quality
Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research
1401 Rockville Pike
Rockville, Maryland, 20852
Telephone: (301) 827-6221

We request that you send a copy of your response to the Food and Drug Administration's Atlanta District Office at the address below.

Sincerely

Steven A. Masiello

Director

Office of Compliance and Biologics Quality
Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research

Page 6 - Walter D. Holder, M.D.

Enclosure:

Form FDA 483, Inspectional Observations, dated September 6, 2001

CC:

Wallace C. Nunley, M.D., Chairman Institutional Review Board Carolinas Medical Center 1000 Blythe Boulevard Charlotte, North Carolina 28203

Ballard H. Graham, Director Food and Drug Administration 60 Eight Street, N.E. Atlanta, Georgia 30309